DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 242 HE 014 754

AUTHOR Brady-Ciampa, Bartholomew
TITLE General Education in Transition: The Partially-Sighted Leading the Blind.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 86p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting on Education Issues and Research (3rd, Columbia, SC, November 6-7, 1981). Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Objectives; Cognitive Ability; College Students; *Communication Skills; *Critical Thinking; *Curriculum Evaluation; Data Collection; Educational Objectives; Enrollment Trends; *General Education; Higher Education; Logical Thinking; State Colleges; *Student Evaluation; Synthesis
IDENTIFIERS *Wayne State College NE

ABSTRACT

Information is presented on a federally-funded project at Wayne State College, Nebraska, which was designed to examine general education and the extent to which the critical thinking skills of communicating, quantifying, analyzing, and synthesizing are being promoted. The project is described in relation to five stages, the specific chronology of events, and critical incidents. Additionally, definitions, desired student achievements, performance level criteria, and data for each of the four skill areas are presented, along with forms that were used during the general education data-gathering process. The primary concern of the project was to address institution-specific outcomes within the parameters of Wayne State College's general education program. General education programs statistics were gathered, including: overall enrollment statistics on statistics by division and semester; overall student-credit-hour production and production by semester for the previous three years; and undergraduate student-credit-hour production by division and semester. Student performance in selected general education courses and course syllabi were evaluated. Student performance was evaluated by both quantitative and qualitative criteria. The overall effort involved specifying where and to what extent each skill is being promoted in each academic division; specifying appropriate measures for each skill area; and implementing an administrative structure to carry out the evaluation plan. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UNSOC
'81
57p
1
1

ED212242

General Education in Transition:

The Partially-Sighted Leading the Blind

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bartholomew Brady-Ciampa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Bartholomew Brady-Ciampa, Ph.D.
Dean of Graduate Studies
Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebraska

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

for presentation at

The Third Annual Conference
on
Educational Issues and Research
at
The University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
November 6-7, 1981

HE014754

General Education in Transition:

The Partially-Sighted Leading the Blind

by

Bartholomew Brady-Ciampa, Ph.D.

The format of this paper is unusual in the sense that it is a first attempt to cohesively, yet comprehensibly present the results of a two-and-one-half year federally-funded project to examine critical thinking skills in higher education. The Academic Program Evaluation Project (APEP), as the project came to be known, was sponsored by the Resource Center for Planned Change (RCPC) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE).

Ten institutions from the more than 350 AASCU member institutions were chosen on a competitive basis to take part in the Project which focused on examining general education models in higher education and trying to determine on each of the ten campuses, where, and to what extent the critical skills of communicating, quantifying, analyzing, and synthesizing were being promoted.

This paper is divided into three segments. The first seeks to link together the narrative description of the Project with the Chronology of Events while, at the same time, indicating Critical Incidents for each of the five Project Stages. The second section of the paper presents the Definitions, Desired Student Achievements, Performance Level Criteria, and data for each of the four skill areas. The final section is devoted to presenting the various forms that are used during the general education data gathering process. These forms are presented as appendices with annotations and may be adapted for use by other institutions wishing to examine their general education programs.

The title of the paper is allegorical in that we recognize that after

2½ years of intense study we are only just beginning to see a crystalization of institutional effort to determine the impact of our general education program upon our students' lives. As such, it is our hope that other institutions of higher learning will be able to adapt this model of institutional self-evaluation to their own unique needs.

The author, while taking full responsibility for the content of this report, is indebted to the following for their contributions without which this study could not have been written: Dr. Ed. M. Elliott, Vice President, Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebraska; Dr. Alan Lupack, APEP Consultant, Wayne State College; the members of the Wayne State College faculty and student body who served on various APEP related committees; the staff and consultants of the Resource Center for Planned Change of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; and the nine other participating APEP institutions and their staffs.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Introduction

In 1977, Wayne State College took two important steps toward improving its general education offerings. The first was the establishment of an ad hoc Committee on General Education, which was charged with reporting on the accomplishments of a program review process which would, in part, support and assist the ad hoc Committee. These two steps were themselves the result of a longstanding commitment to improving general education at Wayne State College. However, with limited institutional funds and resources at our disposal, we found the evaluation of the general education program to be a longer and slower process than we would have wished. When the Academic Program Evaluation Project (APEP), under the sponsorship of the Resource Center for Planned Change (RCPC) of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and supported in part by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), was announced, we still did not know how well we were promoting communication, quantification, analytic, and synthesizing skills and did not have an effective means for finding that out. Therefore, we were eager to participate in the AASCU Project, which would put at our disposal greater resources than would normally be available and allow for a more intense and more widespread evaluation of our general education program than would otherwise be possible. Thus, on August 8, 1979, Wayne State College submitted a proposal titled "Fulfilling a Deferred Commitment: Evaluating Program Effectiveness in General Education--The Role of Wayne State College" to the Resource Center for Planned Change of AASCU for consideration. On September 4, 1979, we were notified that Wayne State College was one of the ten institutions selected nationally to participate in the AASCU Project.

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Setting the Stage

Jan. 9, 1979: Submission of proposal entitled "Fulfilling a Deferred Commitment: Evaluating Program Effectiveness in General Education" to HEW by AASCU.

Feb. 1, 1979: Division Heads continue to be given progress reports on Project.

Feb. 6, 1979: Memo to AASCU institutions announcing a meeting to discuss project in Washington.

Feb. 20, 1979: Meeting in Washington to discuss preliminary proposal.

Mar. 22, 1979: Continued information-sharing with ad hoc Committee on General Education.

Apr. 23-25, 1979: Center Associates National Seminar in Houston, Texas. Project discussed.

May 29, 1979: Key WSC faculty members contacted regarding AASCU Project.

Aug. 8, 1979: Mini-grant proposal "Fulfilling a Deferred Commitment: Evaluating Program Effectiveness in General Education, The Role of Wayne State College" submitted to RCPC, AASCU for consideration.

Sept. 4, 1979: Notification that WSC selected as one of 10 participating institutions in AASCU Project.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Important Preliminary Issues

Important issues of initial concern while the project was being considered were:

1) That there existed general campus agreement that a problem, in fact, existed and was remediable. This was evidenced by standing and ad hoc committees already examining related issues.

2) An apparent consistency between the stated goals of the project being considered and the accepted role and mission statement of the institution.

3) The endorsement of the project proposal by the higher administrative team of the institution.

4) The early and continuous involvement of faculty-at-large, appropriate faculty governance committee, and relevant ad hoc and standing college committees.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Introduction (cont.) Shortly thereafter, we formed an APEP Committee. It was decided that the committee should include a faculty member from each of our eight academic divisions as well as four students. Faculty members were selected by each division in consultation with the Faculty Senate, the Project Director, and the Project Coordinator. The Committee agreed that at some future date three additional faculty members would be selected to comment on and provide constructive criticism regarding the work of the committee. (These three members were, in fact, selected and contacted on March 13, 1980.) Both the faculty and the administration considered it especially important to have representatives from every academic division on the Committee so that the project would be recognized as being the concern of the entire campus. It was also felt that faculty members on the Committee should, as far as possible, be remunerated from project funds for work beyond that which is normally considered a part of their regular duties.		Important Preliminary Issues (cont.) 5) An early agreement on a non-threatening research design and process.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage I

The first stage of the project, and therefore the first task for the Committee, was to arrive at definitions of those skills which a general education program should promote, that is, Communication, Quantification, Analysis, Synthesis, and Valuing or Judgment skills. A major concern of the Committee as they undertook this task was that the definitions not reflect any preconceived notions about where in the curriculum the skills should be or are taught. For example, we did not want to assume in our definitions that quantification is solely the concern of the Mathematics department or communication solely the concern of the English department. It was also felt that the definitions arrived at should not be so broad and general as to be useless for the purposes of the project.

The Committee decided that it would work on one definition per week for a five-week period. This would allow members substantial time to consult with colleagues in their respective divisions and to clarify and formulate their own notions of communication, quantification, analysis, synthesis, and valuing. After discussing each other's definitions, members could then rethink and refine their own definitions for a future meeting until some agreement could be reached.

The process of defining the basic terms proved to be a difficult task. In discussions of initial definitions, there was considerable disagreement. Two major objections to the kinds of definitions presented were raised. The first was that some Committee members had written definitions in terms of their own disciplines rather than definitions that would apply to general education. One member observed that, even within a given discipline, such definitions would result in our setting higher levels of student achievement than those we would

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage I

Oct. 1, 1979: Project officially begins; Campus background work underway.

Nov. 9, 1979: Meeting with Faculty Senate to discuss goals of AASCU Project, procedures agreed upon for selection of faculty to Planning Committee.

Nov. 15, 1979: Working Draft #1 completed, given to Faculty Senate, Division Heads.

Nov. 19, 1979: Presentation of Project overview to Health, Physical Education, and Athletics Division

Nov. 30, 1979: Selection of Planning Committee at Senate meeting.

Dec. 3, 1979: Notification of selection to members of Planning Committee, background materials sent.

Dec. 5, 1979: Progress report of AASCU/FIPSE Project to full faculty meeting.

Dec. 6-7, 1979: Organizational meeting of AASCU/FIPSE Planning Committee.

Dec. 10-12, 1979: Initial meeting of campus directors and coordinators in Washington, D.C.

Dec. 14, 1979: Division Heads apprised of progress of APEP and requested to arrange an "hour of conversation" between the Division's Planning Committee representative, Dr. Elliott, Dr. Ciampa, and Division faculty regarding the Project.

Jan. 14, 1980: Meeting of AASCU/FIPSE Planning Committee to discuss procedure for arriving at conceptual definitions of skill areas.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage I

During Stage I of the Project it was imperative that:

1) Each of the respective divisions be allowed to determine the method (either election, appointment, consensus) by which its committee representative is selected.

2) As early as possible in the APEP process, as many faculty members, administrators, students, and standing College committees be apprised of the goals and processes of the project and that they be continually updated on the project's progress.

3) The process of working toward the project's goals be recognized as being as valuable as the potential products which might emerge.

4) Administrative intervention be minimized and the perception fostered

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage I (cont.)

expect from general education students. The second objection was that some of the definitions contained too much "educational jargon" which obfuscated rather than clarified the term in question.

The first definition to be considered was that of "communication." The problems involved in agreeing to the meaning of this term in some ways typify those encountered in attempting to define each of the terms. A number of the initial definitions focused on written and oral communication or implied that these were the only means of communication. There were objections to these definitions because they excluded non-verbal methods of communication. They made no provision for communication through scientific languages. Under these definitions, for example, the kind of message included on the Voyager satellite and designed to give some notion of our world to an extraterrestial civilization--that is, the pictures, music, and equations which scientists have included--would not be considered a means of communicating.

After revision and rewriting, a working definition of "communication" was arrived at:

> Competence in communication, in a very broad sense, involves all those procedures that allow an individual to express him/herself effectively. Within this broad range two distinct, though clearly related, types of competence may be identified. The first type is verbal competence. It is the ability to speak and write clearly and effectively. The second type is non-verbal competence. Skills in this area are displayed in a variety of non-verbal systems of codification, which range from aesthetic symbols to gesture and digital language systems. From this definition it follows that effective communication is a form of human behavior that may be exhibited in a variety of media and contexts.

(It should be noted that this and the following definitions were considered tentative by the Committee. Members felt that it would be better

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage I (cont.)

Jan. 21, 1980: Meeting of AASCU/FIPSE Planning Committee to discuss 1st Skill Area: Communication Skills. Tentative consensus arrived at regarding conceptual definition.

Jan. 23, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Elliott to Division of Education regarding AASCU/FIPSE grant.

Jan. 28, 1980: Meeting of Faculty Committee to discuss 2nd Skill Area: Quantitative Skills. Tentative consensus arrived at regarding conceptual definition.

Feb. 4, 1980: Meeting of Faculty Committee to discuss Analysis and Synthesis Skills. Committee will revise four tentative skills definitions and be considering the definition of Valuing Skills.

Feb. 6, 1980: Division Heads apprised of AASCU/FIPSE Committee's progress.

Feb. 11, 1980: Meeting of Faculty Committee to revise all five skill areas. Committee will spend next several weeks with further revisions.

Feb. 20, 1980: Draft of five skill areas sent to Committee for reactions. Committee members are to work on competency levels for next two weeks.

Feb. 25, 1980: Student government elects four student representatives to serve on AASCU/FIPSE General Education Committee.

Mar. 3-5, 1980: Second meeting of Campus Directors and Coordinators in Washington, D.C.

Mar. 8, 1980: Dr. Elliott and Dr. Ciampa make APEP presentation to Nebraska State College Board of Trustees-Lincoln. Coverage on KOLN-TV, Channel 10-Omaha.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage I (cont.)

that the primary administrative function is facilitative in nature.

5) The general education program be recognized as an institution-wide program to inhibit the development of vested interest groups, turf-protecting, and hidden agendas.

6) All work of the APEP Committee be considered tentative and subject to revision by the full faculty.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage I (cont.)

to have a working definition rather than a formal one, not only because of the difficulty of achieving a consensus but also because they expected that their own understanding of the complex terms involved would grow in the course of the project.)

There was even greater controversy over the definition of "quantification." In fact, no general agreement was reached initially (as is reflected in the initial working definition). Some of the faculty in the Fine Arts Division, for example, went so far as to say that quantification was a skill with which they were not concerned. The general working definition that came to be used is as follows:

> Just as college graduates must be able to express themselves in an organized, clear, concise manner using appropriate verbal and non-verbal symbols, they must also be familiar with basic quantitative principles and procedures.
>
> Quantitative competence involves the ability to find solutions to quantitatively-based problems. It also includes the ability to discern limits of quantitative techniques--that is, to determine when these techniques are not suitable for solving a problem.

Working definitions of "analysis" and "synthesis" were accepted with somewhat less controversy.

> Analytic skill involves identifying the parts of a whole and the relationships of those parts to the whole. It includes the ability to identify the essential components of ideas, events, problems, and processes; to draw logical deductions about those components; and to recognize the limitations of these deductions. Since most problems are not isolated from one another, analytic skill includes the ability to establish relationships, where they exist, between problems.
>
> Analytic competence also involves the ability to think critically and to solve problems.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage I (cont.)

Synthesizing skills are those which help an individual integrate basic knowledge, feelings, or the like. At all levels of every field of study and work this skill allows individuals to create innovative combinations of ideas, objects, processes, and people. Students with highly developed synthesizing skills are adept at putting apparently unrelated facts into a common frame of reference. They are able to find unifying themes or common threads that enable them to deal effectively with diffuse bodies of information. They not only possess a facility for constructing a general framework to accommodate whatever information they have, but they can move beyond that information, applying its principles to new situations or other bodies of information.

And finally, there was some feeling that the working definition of "valuing" would need considerable refinement. It initially read:

Values influence the behavior of people. Valuing means judging benefits, liabilities, effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses according to certain criteria. Since values play such an important role in life, it is important to be able to identify them and to have some idea of how they are formed. Education can help people to develop the ability to identify their own values and the value systems of others. Furthermore, education can help people determine how values influence decisions and how they translate into behavior that might affect other people. (It was ultimately decided to incorporate elements of valuing into the other four skill areas and to eliminate it as an independent entity.)

Although there was some controversy over the definitions of the basic terms under consideration in the project, several members of the committee felt that the process of attempting to define the terms may, in the long run, be as valuable as the definitions ultimately agreed upon since this process forced them to examine their division's and their own role in general education at Wayne State College and to come

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage I (cont.) to grips with some basic and important questions regarding general education.		

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage II

The second stage of the project, establishing criteria for determining whether or not students had acquired the basic skills that general education should promote, began in March, 1980. Our aim in this portion of the project was for the Committee, in consultation with the administration and the faculty-at-large, to determine for each of the five skill areas the level of performance expected of undergraduates at Wayne State College. Some criteria were established, but in view of the revisions of the definitions, these too needed to be revised. There is a general feeling that these criteria will not be finalized until the evaluation process (Stage IV) has progressed further.

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage II

Mar. 10, 1980: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss writing of performance levels for Stage Two of Project. Overview of next three Project Stages.

Mar. 10, 1980: Division Heads apprised of APEP progress and given a report on APEP meeting in Washington, March 3-5, 1980.

Mar. 13, 1980: Three faculty members (not on APEP Committee) contacted regarding their serving as consultants to provide constructive criticism to Committee.

Mar. 20, 1980: Ms. Marina Buhler-Miko, APEP Director, conducts site visitation. Meeting held with Dr. Elliott, Dr. Ciampa, Division Heads, Faculty Senate, APEP Committee, and Planning for the Eighties Committee.

Mar. 24, 1980: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss student outcomes in Communication, Quantification, and Analysis areas.

Apr. 2, 1980: Meeting with English department faculty to discuss proposed changes in English Composition (General Education) program for 1980-81 academic year.

Apr. 14-15, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Elliott to North Central Association meeting in Chicago.

Apr. 14, 1980: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss student outcomes in Synthesis and Analysis area. Also, summer assignments discussed.

Apr. 16-18, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Elliott to Center Association of the AASCU Resource Center for Planned Change meeting in Atlanta.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage II

During Stage II of the Project it was imperative that:

1) The Committee recognize and call upon those faculty and staff members who have special expertise in the respective skill areas for their counsel in determining appropriate performance levels.

2) The Committee recognize the importance of consulting the faculty-at-large concerning the procedures by which student performance evidence be gathered, interpreted, and reported.

3) Although standardized instruments may be used to assess the various skills, the primary concern of the project was to address institution-specific outcomes within the parameters of Wayne State College's general education program.

4) The most efficient and effective

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
	Stage II (cont.) Apr. 22, 1980: Report to full faculty meeting regarding APEP Committee progress. May 9, 1980: Meeting of APEP Committee; Summer assignments discussed, reporting format discussed, etc. May 12, 1980: Meeting with external faculty consultants to discuss process of critiqueing APEP progress report. June 1, 2, 3, 1980: Meeting in Washington with AASCU/RCPC Staff and other APEP institutions to discuss Phase I, Stages II and III. Aug. 8-9, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Elliott to Nebraska State College Board of Trustees meeting in Wayne. Aug. 11, 1980: Reports submitted by APEP Committee Members and three WSC Faculty Consultants. Aug. 22, 1980: New faculty/staff meeting. APEP overview. Aug. 25, 1980: Brief progress report to general faculty at opening faculty meeting. Sept. 10, 1980: APEP Committee/Consultant meeting to discuss Stages III, IV & V. Sept. 10, 1980: Report on APEP progress by Dr. Elliott to Nebraska State College Board of Trustees meeting in Lincoln, Nebraska. Sept. 11, 1980: Presentation to Faculty Senate regarding APEP progress and plans for APEP retreat. Sept. 17, 18, 19, 1980: Meeting in St. Louis with AASCU/RCPC staff and other APEP institutions to discuss Stages IV and V.	Stage II (cont.) mode of evidence-gathering be employed while being mindful of the faculty's workload and day-to-day professional obligations to their classes; with minimal disruption of normal curricular routine; with the least threatening (to both students and faculty) possible process of data gathering, analysis, and reporting. 5) The process employed to determine the extent to which desired student outcomes are achieved be academically defensible and easily understood by the faculty.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
	Stage II (cont.) Sept. 26, 1980: APEP Retreat involving Division Heads, Faculty Senate, Futures Planning Committee, APEP Committee, Campus Director, Coordinator, and President. Oct. 4, 1980: Report on APEP progress by Dr. Elliott to Nebraska State College Board of Trustees. Oct. 8, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Ciampa to Health, P.E., and Athletic Division regarding APEP progress and projections.	

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage III

The third stage of the project required the development of a procedure by which to determine whether, where, and to what extent undergraduates at Wayne State College acquire skills in communication, quantification, analysis, synthesis, and valuing. As part of the basis for determining which students and how many students would be selected for testing and to assist in future decisions regarding curriculum, statistics relating to the general education program were gathered during this stage of the project. The data collected included:

1) Enrollment statistics (overall) for selected general education courses during the last three years including the number of sections offered, total enrollment, student-credit-hour production, and average section size.

2) Enrollment statistics (by semester) for each selected general education course during the last three academic years including number of sections, total enrollment, average section size, and percent of each division's general education contribution to the total institutional general education program.

3) Data regarding student-credit-hour production in these selected general education courses (by division of instruction) as a percent of the total general education program semester-by-semester for the last three years.

4) Student-credit-hour production (by semester for the past three years) as a percent of the total undergraduate production for selected general education courses. This information includes general education student-credit-hour production and general education as a percent of total undergraduate student-credit-hour production.

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage III

Oct. 9, 1980: APEP Committee meeting to discuss procedures for data gathering, course/faculty sampling, etc.

Oct. 17, 1980: Paper on General Education delivered by Dr. Ciampa at Professional Organizational Development Network Conference in San Francisco.

Oct. 21, 1980: Meeting of Graduate Teaching Assistants to discuss their potential roles in gathering student performance data.

Oct. 22, 1980: APEP Committee Meeting to discuss student performance data gathering strategies.

Oct. 29, 1980: Personal letters seeking support for the data-gathering phase of the APEP Project sent to 119 faculty members.

Nov. 10, 1980: Meeting of Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Alan Lupack to discuss possibility of his serving as case writer for the project.

Nov. 12, 1980: Meeting of Dr. Ciampa, Dr. Elliott, and Dr. A. Lupack to discuss requirements of the case writer and the desired elements of the case study.

Nov. 12, 1980: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss the response to memo to faculty regarding data collecting.

Nov. 17, 1980: Brief report on APEP progress to Division Heads.

Nov. 18, 1980: Report on APEP progress to full faculty.

Dec. 4, 1980: Meeting of Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Al Lupack, Case Writer for APEP Project. Also, announcement made to Graduate Faculty.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage III

During Stage III of the Project it was imperative that:

1) Each committee member submit a report by August, 1980, which is the result of an examination of each respective division's curriculum to the Wayne State College general education program in light of the committee-generated definitions of the five generic skills.

2) The three consulting faculty members submit reports by August, 1980, which critique all Committee work up to that date.

3) During September, 1980, the Committee determine which specific courses in the general education program will be examined and the method by which students enrolled in these courses will be sampled.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage III (cont.) 5) Undergraduate student-credit-hour production (by division, semester-by-semester) for the last three years. 6) Enrollment statistics (by division, semester-by-semester) for the last three years, including average section size, general education student-credit-hour production as a percent of total institutional general education and as a percent of the total undergraduate student-credit-hour production. The next concern of the Committee was the testing process to be used to determine the levels our students had achieved in the skill areas in question. At first the Committee leaned toward using some sort of "objective" test, such as that devised by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). However, in the Committee's discussions several objections to relying on this or similar tests as the primary method of testing arose. Someone noted that these tests had their own kind of subjectivity and that assuming the objectivity of an "unproven" test could be misleading. Perhaps a more serious objection was that such tests were necessarily obtrusive and intrusive. If they were given during regular class hours, they would take time from classroom instruction. Many of the faculty would be loath to surrender such time. Thus, we would not get as wide a sampling as we would like. Such a process might be detrimental to the spirit of cooperation and participation that we had attempted to foster throughout the project. Another objection was that even if sufficient faculty support could be mustered, there was a likelihood that we would have difficulty eliciting sufficient and appropriate student response. If students were forced to take the tests in a given class, they might not attend the	Stage III (cont.) Dec. 30, 1980: Presentation by Dr. Ciampa to the Santa Barbara, California, Kiwanis regarding APEP. Jan. 6, 1981: Meeting of Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Al Lupack to discuss his case study writing responsibilities. Jan. 14, 1981: Meeting of Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Alan Lupack to discuss first draft of case study narrative.	Stage III (cont.) 4) During the Fall of 1980 a retreat/workshop be scheduled for members of the APEP Committee, the three faculty critics, and the Faculty Senate to discuss the goals and procedures of the project. 5) During the Fall of 1980, institution-wide, general education programs statistics be gathered which include: a) Enrollment statistics (overall) b) Enrollment statistics (by semester) c) Data regarding overall student-credit-hour production d) Student-credit-hour production (by semester for the previous three years) e) Undergraduate student-credit-hour production (by division, semester-by-semester)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage III (cont.) class or they might take the test but not take it seriously. Student members of the Committee were also concerned that the testing of students for proficiency in the various skills would constitute a repetition of the kinds of testing they underwent in some of their courses, especially a course such as Freshman Composition. Although they were assured that this is not the case, there is little doubt that some, if not many, of our students would perceive an additional battery of tests in this way. On the other hand, it was felt that if students were asked to volunteer to take the tests, we would not get a large enough sampling to make the results valid for evaluating the general education program as a whole. In addition, those students who would volunteer are likely to be the better students, those who would feel most comfortable taking the tests and, therefore, those most likely to do well on them. This would influence the results since the sampling of students would be of above-average ability. The atypical sampling would, of course, invalidate any conclusions we might draw. One further consideration was that even if this kind of testing could be administered in such a way as to provide a valid indication of whether or not our general education program was successful in promoting the defined skills, it could not provide some of the basic information we were seeking in the AASCU Project. From its initiation, one of the aims of the project had been not only to seek information on whether students are acquiring some fundamental skills in their general education courses, but also to discover where in the general education program these skills were being promoted. The Committee felt that we would not be aided in obtaining this information by administer-		Stage III (cont.) f) Enrollment statistics (by division, semester-by-semester) 6) Subsequent to the final examination period (December, 1980), student performance evidence which has been gathered from selected general education courses be prepared for analysis. 7) During the period from January through April, 1981, expert committees of the faculty and student body be constituted to examine and evaluate student performance evidence. 8) During the summer of 1981, student performance evidence be analyzed and reports of this evaluation submitted to the project Campus Coordinator for synthesis. 9) As a result of the performance evidence analysis, course syllabi be examined voluntarily by each respective

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage III (cont.) ing tests such as those prepared by the ETS or by administering similar tests, whether prepared by an outside body or by our own faculty. After much consideration, consultation, and discussion, the Committee felt that the only type of testing that would help us to obtain all the information needed would be something associated with regular courses but judged rather on the basis of promoting the defined skills than on the basis of the specific objectives of those courses. It was decided that the least obtrusive and intrusive way of gathering this information would be to collect papers, tests, and quizzes written for specific classes. This procedure assured that students would take tests seriously and do their best on assignments since they counted toward their classroom grades. It was, in short, a non-obtrusive method of gathering data nor did it intrude on the normal functioning of the class. No time was taken away from classroom instruction for administering extra tests. Since names were removed from papers before they were evaluated, students had no fear of repercussions for poor performance; and while some of the faculty might have felt threatened by having their assignments and their students evaluated, most understood that the results were not to be used to judge or criticize individual instructors. Approximately 50 percent of the faculty contributed materials for evaluation, and the process of gathering material continued throughout the Spring 1981 semester. We were aware that in this method of evaluation there are some pitfalls which had to be avoided. It was always kept in mind that the material gathered was not being judged as an assignment for a chemistry, history, math, or art course but rather as an indication of the ability		Stage III (cont.) faculty member toward minimizing the dissonance between stated course objectives and actual course objectives achieved.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage III (cont.)

to communicate, analyze, etc. Therefore, the material was not judged by the professor submitting it or even by those in the same discipline (though these professors might have been consulted by the evaluating committee). It was our intention to establish mini- or sub-committees from the faculty-at-large to determine both whether the tests or assignments demanded of the student an ability to communicate, quantify, etc. and whether the students had in fact shown these abilities.

It was also important that consistent criteria be used in evaluating all the material gathered. The AASCU Committee, with the assistance of the sub-committees, finalized the criteria to be used and the methods of evaluating these criteria. Thus, a systematic method of evaluation based on clearly delineated criteria was achieved. This provided a readily comprehensible means of reporting the results of our evaluation.

It was also left as an option that selected classes be asked to take a test such as that prepared by the ETS to validate the results of our primary method of evaluation. There was, however, no final determination as to whether or how this would be done.

Besides providing more of the information we needed, the method of testing we decided upon had several other advantages. First of all, it drew on the expertise of our own faculty and required the participation of a greater number of the faculty--both as contributors of material and as evaluators of that material. This made the AASCU Project at Wayne State College more of a grass-roots effort and perhaps made the faculty as a whole more understanding of its aims and more willing to accept and implement changes that the project determined our curriculum was in need of. Our method also made more of the faculty aware of the

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage III (cont.) necessity to promote the defined skills and of the ways that this could be done in a variety of courses. It was hoped that this would lead to greater respect and cooperation among colleagues and more awareness among the faculty of the problems of their colleagues. For example, those who never assign essays in their classes might have become more conscious of the difficulties encountered by those who do so regularly. In short, by approaching our evaluation process with an awareness of the possible pitfalls involved in it, we believed we could avoid those pitfalls and capitalize on its advantages.		

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage IV

In Stage IV of the project, our key objectives were to form faculty evaluation committees to deal with the large amount of material collected. During the Spring 1981 semester, these committees were formed and began the task of finalizing the criteria by which student material was to be evaluated. The summer of 1981 was devoted to the evaluation of this material. Reports from the committees were submitted to the Project Coordinator in August, 1981.

The sets of tests, quizzes, essays, midterm and final evaluations, projects, etc., were catalogued in the Graduate Office and made available to members of each of the four APEP Skills Subcommittees.

Each subcommittee member selected sets of performance data which seemed to manifest specific skills, and student's performance was evaluated on a Likert type scale ranging from not effective (1) to highly effective (5).

Subcommittee members recorded this information on a specially designed evaluation form; one form per set of materials evaluated. These forms were then collated and summarized along with the forms of the other members of the specific skill subcommittee.

On the basis of the statistical summary sheets, the following data were gathered for each skill area:

1) Number of course evaluations
2) Number of different evaluators
3) Number of student evaluations
4) Overall mean of attained skill level
5) Mean score of attained skill level by:
   a) General education courses
   b) Non-General education courses

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage IV

Jan. 15, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss evaluation of data process and selection of faculty evaluation committees.

Jan. 19, 1981: Presentation by Dr. Ciampa to teachers' workshop, Pierce Public Schools, Pierce, Nebraska, APEP and academic skills.

Jan. 22, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss criteria for sub-committees. Also, meeting of Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Lupack to discuss narrative progress.

Jan. 29, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss progress with sub-committee selection. Communications skills revision.

Feb. 5, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee. Subcommittee selection criteria discussed in addition to skills definition modifications. Meeting between Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Lupack.

Feb. 11-13, 1981: Meeting of APEP Campus Directors and Coordinators in Washington, D.C. Discussion of Stages IV and V of paradigm.

Mar. 5, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee. Subcommittees selected, discussion of evaluation procedures, time-line for completion of project discussed. Meeting between Dr. Ciampa and Dr. Lupack.

Mar. 11, 1981: Memos sent to conveners and skill subcommittees regarding timelines for evaluation of student data.

Mar. 19, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee. Process for and timeline for subcommittee work discussed. Also discussed was the revision process to the definitions. Also, meeting between Dr. Lupack and Dr. Ciampa.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage IV

During Stage IV of the Project it was imperative that:

1) APEP Committee members, during early Fall, 1980, examine the general education curriculum on a course-by-course basis to determine which courses and constituent students would best be sampled to meet the project's goals.

2) Faculty members teaching general education courses during the Fall, 1980, semester be given the opportunity to volunteer to take part in the evaluation stage of the project.

3) Student performance evidence on a course-by-course basis be continuously gathered throughout the Fall, 1980, semester. This evidence may include copies of quizzes, tests, essays, final exams, projects, term papers, etc.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

Stage IV (cont.)

6) Mean score of attained skill level by:
   a) 100 level course
   b) 200 level course
   c) 300 level course
   d) 400 level course
7) Mean score of attained skill level by:
   a) Applied Science Division
   b) Business Division
   c) Education/Psychology Division
   d) Fine Arts Division
   e) HPERA Division
   f) Humanities Division
   g) Math/Science Division
   h) Social Sciences Division
8) Mean score of attained skill level by:
   a) Evaluator A
   b) Evaluator B
   c) Evaluator C

In order to achieve as high a degree of consistency as possible in evaluating student performance data, each skill area subcommittee:

1) Held several meetings to determine the specific evaluation criteria to be applied to each set of student performance data;

2) Examined numerous sets of student performance data to come to consensus on which sets best manifested performance in the specific skill to be evaluated by their committee;

3) Conducted several "trial runs" to determine how consistently each subcommittee member's evaluations compared with others.

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage IV (cont.)

Mar. 25, 1981: Meeting of Analysis Subcommittee to discuss procedure for evaluating Analysis Skills.

Mar. 26, 1981: APEP meeting to discuss progress of subcommittee work.

Mar. 31, 1981: Meeting of Quantification Subcommittee to discuss procedure for evaluating Quantification Skills.

Apr. 1, 1981: Meeting of Synthesis Subcommittee to discuss procedure for evaluating Synthesis Skills.

Apr. 2, 1981: Meeting of APEP Committee to discuss Consultant's visit.

Apr. 3, 1981: Meeting of Communication Skills subcommittee to discuss evaluation of student materials.

Apr. 4-20, 1981: Additional meetings of APEP Skills subcommittees regarding individual evaluation processes.

Apr. 22-24, 1981: Consulting visit by Dr. Gary Peterson, Florida State University; Meetings with Dr. Elliott, Dr. Ciampa, APEP Committee, Subcommittee Chairmen, External Consultants, Dr. Alan Lupack, etc.

May 13, 1981: Meeting with Dr. Al Lupack regarding continuing work on APEP narrative.

May 1 - Aug. 31, 1981: APEP Subcommittees evaluating student-generated data. Final reports to be submitted by subcommittee members by September 1, 1981. Many discussions between Drs. Lupack, Ciampa, Elliott.

June 1-3, 1981: Meeting of APEP Campus Directors/Coordinators with RCPC Staff in Washington, D.C.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage IV (cont.)

4) The anonymity of all students be preserved throughout the duration of the project.

5) Faculty members be assured that they will not be judged by the performance of their students.

6) Very close contact be maintained between APEP Committee members and the faculty members teaching the general education courses which are being examined.

7) During the Fall, 1980, semester, faculty members teaching general education courses be encouraged to up-date course syllabi.

8) Criteria be identified to determine the process by which the faculty evaluation committees (which will evaluate student evidence) will be constituted.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage IV (cont.) To add another dimension to this "check" for consistency each subcommittee submitted its evaluations, the mean score of attained skill level by each evaluator was determined. As seen in the Quantification Skills material, for example, after each evaluator completed approximately 500 student performance data examples, their mean final score results were 3.56, 3.57, and 3.58 (on a scale of 1-5) respectively. In addition to the information previously referred to, the Communication Skills Subcommittee decided to computerize its evaluations and to add the following 20 questions to gain insight into less quantifiable but, nonetheless, very significant information: 1) Are the student responses in technical or scientific language? 2) Are the student responses in non-technical or non-scientific language? 3) Are the student responses in both types of language? 4) Do the responses convey information and ideas clearly? 5) Do the responses convey information and ideas coherently? 6) Do the responses convey information and ideas correctly? 7) Do the responses convey information and ideas concisely? 8) Do the responses convey information and ideas in an organized manner? 9) Do the responses convey information and ideas in a manner that is appropriate to the context? 10) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values clearly? 11) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values coherently? 12) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values correctly? 13) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values concisely? 14) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values in an organized manner?		Stage IV (cont.) 9) During the Spring, 1981, semester the faculty evaluation committees identify criteria by which student evidence will be evaluated. 10) During the Summer of 1981, the actual evaluation and analysis of student evidence be carried out with Committee reports being submitted to the Project Coordinator in August, 1981.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage IV (cont.) 15) Do the responses convey feelings, attitudes, and values in a manner that is appropriate to the context? 16) Do the responses indicate that the respondent has received and understood the information and ideas conveyed through speech and writing? 17) Do the responses indicate that the respondent has received and understood the feelings, attitudes, and values conveyed through speech and writing? 18) Do the responses indicate that the respondent has received and understood the information and ideas conveyed through art, literature, and music? 19) Do the responses indicate that the respondent has received and understood the feelings, attitudes, and values conveyed through art, literature, and music? 20) Question of choice. From a research perspective, two major questions that arose were: Will the data be valid; that is, will it measure what it claims to measure? And, will the data be reliable; that is, will it measure accurately and consistently from one time to another? In addition, we considered the matter of internal validity (whether the observed occurrences were influenced by extraneous or uncontrolled factors) and external validity (whether the systematic relationships that were to be identified could be generalized--that is, used to predict relationships outside the Wayne State setting). Another issue that was considered in the analysis of the data was that the role of intervening and extraneous variables (those that cannot be controlled or measured directly but may have an important effect on the outcome of the Project).		

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE

age V

The objectives of Stage V of the Project were to evaluate the data student performance and determine the worth of the level of student neric skill attainment consistent with the role and mission of Wayne ate College and to remove discrepancies between desired and actual vels of student attainment; to reenter various project stages if finitions needed modification or if new assessment/evaluation ocedures needed to be adopted.

The assessment design developed by Wayne State College defined the rameters of the evaluation approach. The evaluation component of the oject sought to determine the extent to which our institution promoted dergraduate competence in each of the four skill areas ultimately reed upon. In other words, based on our approach to assessment, culty members should have been able to identify and, perhaps, design asures which demonstrated whether or how well Wayne State had accomished its goals for student achievement in each of the four skill eas. In this regard we are attempting to: 1) specify where and to at extent in each academic division, each skill is being promoted; specify appropriate measures for each skill area, ranging perhaps, om unobtrusive measures to formal testing to expert judgment; 3) sign and/or identify the necessary and appropriate administrative ructure to carry out the evaluation plan. Decisions must continue to made after the final analysis of student performance data regarding remediation of any discrepancies between the real and the ideal vels of student performance in the various skill areas. Determinations ich identify whether such discrepancies are extant because of a lack appropriate resources, an inappropriate curricular program, or an ffective curricular design must continue to be made. In order to

APEP CHRONOLOGY

Stage V

Sept. 1, 1981: APEP Skills Subcommittee Reports submitted.

Sept. 21-23, 1981: Meeting of APEP Campus Directors/Coordinators with RCPC Staff in Cullowhee, North Carolina.

Nov. 1, 1981: "Final Case History" to Resource Center for Planned Change, AASCU

Nov. 2-30, 1981: RCPC call-back for clarification of Nov. 1, 1981, report.

Dec. 15, 1981: Draft of RCPC "Preliminary Final" Report sent to Wayne State College for review.

Dec. 30, 1981: Institutional call-back to RCPC for suggested changes in Dec. 15 draft.

Jan. 15, 1982: Final Wayne State College Case History submitted to RCPC, AASCU.

Jan. 16-31, 1982: RCPC call-back for clarification of Jan. 15 text.

Feb. 1, 1982: RCPC all-but-Final Report to WSC for review.

Feb. 10, 1982: Institutional call-back for last desired changes in Feb. 1, 1982 text.

Feb. 15, 1982: Final AASCU/FIPSE report submitted to FIPSE.

APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Stage V

During Stage V of the Project it was imperative that:

1) As a result of the analysis of student performance data, the APEP Committee be central in the task of recommending procedures by which the findings of the project are to be presented to the College's various constituencies for discussion.

2) The College's administration promulgate the perception that the general education program is an institution-wide program and rests in the hands of the entire faculty.

3) The faculty of the institution be helped to recognize that curricular evaluation (and resultant modification) is a desirable phenomenon in higher education and a necessary element in curricular evolution toward increased

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION PROJECT NARRATIVE	APEP CHRONOLOGY	APEP CRITICAL INCIDENTS
Stage V (cont.) minimize these discrepancies, institutional policies and procedures must continue to be examined and modified by institutional consensus in light of student performance data. Although the AASCU Project is not yet quite completed and has not yet effected significant changes in our curriculum, some benefits of our participation in the Project can already be seen. All of us at Wayne State College have been made conscious of the complex issues involved in evaluating and improving our general education program. Many on campus have, despite the difficulties, committed themselves to this improvement. Perhaps most important, there has been a good deal of communication about our problems and our goals. The Project Director and the Project Coordinator have, since the first days of the project, consulted regularly with the Faculty Senate, the Futures Planning Committee, and the Division Heads. The Project Director has kept the Nebraska State College Board of Trustees informed of our progress. The Project Coordinator has kept the faculty up-to-date and has spoken to various educational groups about the Project. Faculty members have shared their ideas and opinions with the AASCU Committee and with their other colleagues. It is hoped that this communication, coupled with our measurement of student achievement and our analysis of our general education offerings, will lead to an accurate evaluation of where we are and ultimately to the synthesis which will improve general education at Wayne State College.		Stage V (cont.) effectiveness. 4) New policies resulting in curricular change are the result of curricular evaluation and <u>not</u> the evaluation of specific individuals or divisions of instruction. 5) A mechanism be employed for the continuing evaluation of the general education curriculum.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Definition

Competence in communication, in a very broad sense, involves all those procedures that allow an individual to express him/herself effectively. Within this broad range two distinct, though clearly related, types of competence may be identified. The first type is verbal competence. It is the ability to speak and write clearly and effectively. The second type is non-verbal competence. Skills in this area are displayed in a variety of non-verbal systems of codification, which range from aesthetic symbols to gesture and digital language systems. From this definition it follows that effective communication is a form of human behavior that may be exhibited in a variety of media and contexts.

Desired Student Achievement

Students receiving the baccalaureate degree from Wayne State College should have the following abilities:

1) To convey effectively information and ideas in speech, writing, and scientific and technical languages in a clear, coherent, correct, organized, concise, and appropriate manner.

2) To convey feelings, expressions, and values by means of verbal and non-verbal communication systems.

3) To receive and understand information, ideas, feelings, attitudes, and values from speech and writing.

4) To understand ideas, emotions and values conveyed in art, literature, and music. (Expression through art, literature, and music is a significant form of communication. While it is desirable to students achieving proficiency in such methods of communication, it is not something that can be required at the level of general education.)

Performance Level Criteria

Members of the Communication Skills subcommittee will evaluate the level of each student's performance on a scale ranging from highly effective to not effective. Highly effective performance indicates a superlative level of student achievement while performance judged to be not effective suggests that the student has serious difficulty displaying an acceptable level of achievement.

Data

Number of Course Evaluations = 34

Number of Different Evaluators = 4

Number of Student Evaluations = 868

Overall Mean of Attained Communications Skills = 3.38

Mean Score of Attained Communications Skills:

General Education Courses = 3.41, n = 501

Non-General Education Courses = 3.33, n = 367

Mean Score of Attained Communications Skills by Course Level:

100 level = 3.38	Student n = 581
200 level = 3.33	Student n = 254
300 level = 3.76	Student n = 33
400 level = -	Student n = 0

Mean Score of Attained Communications Skills by Division:

App. Sci. = 3.44, n = 317	HPERA = 3.23, n = 202
Business = - , n = 0	Humanities = 3.39, n = 235
Ed/Psych = 3.90, n = 11	Math/Sci = 2.97, n = 48
Fine Arts = - , n = 0	Soc Sci = 3.74, n = 55

Mean Score of Attained Communications Skills by Each Evaluator:

Evaluator I = 3.18, n = 312
Evaluator J = 3.52, n = 311
Evaluator K = 3.35, n = 234
Evaluator L = 3.94, n = 11

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Communications

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
PED 241 First Aid	essay	Czupryn	72	3.23
PED 241 First Aid	essay	Ridings	57	3.23
* ITE 104 Gen Crafts	test	Lupack	34	3.20
* ITE 104 Gen Crafts	test	Czupryn	34	3.20
* ITE 104 Gen Crafts	test	Ridings	34	3.20
* MAT 110 Fund Math	test	Lupack	16	3.08
* ENG 170 Appr. to Lit.	essay test	Lupack	57	3.5
* ENG 170 Appr. to Lit.	essay test	Czupryn	58	3.5
* ENG 170 Appr. to Lit.	essay test	Ridings	21	3.5
SOC 200 Soc Probs	essay test	Lupack	11	3.70
SOC 200 Soc Probs	essay test	Czupryn	10	3.70
SOC 200 Soc Probs	essay test	Ridings	1	3.70

SUMMARY

Skill: _____

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 3

Number of student evaluations = 405

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.33

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Communications

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
SOC 330 Polit. Anthr.	essay test	Lupack	16	3.76
SOC 330 Polit. Anthr.	essay test	Czupryn	16	3.76
SOC 330 Polit. Anthr.	essay test	Ridings	1	3.76
* ITE 104 Gen. Crafts	quiz	Lupack	14	3.42
* ITE 104 Gen. Crafts	quiz	Czupryn	14	3.42
* ITE 104 Gen. Crafts	quiz	Ridings	13	3.42
* MAT 110 Fund. Math	test	Czupryn	16	2.92
* MAT 110 Fund. Math	test	Ridings	16	2.92
GST 196 Impr. Writ.	writing sample	Lupack	33	3.25
GST 196 Impr. Writ.	writing sample	Czupryn	33	3.25
GST 196 Impr. Writ.	writing sample	Ridings	33	3.25
PED 241 First Aid	essay	Lupack	73	3.23

SUMMARY

Skill: _____

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 3

Number of student evaluations = 278

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.29

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Communications

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* ITE 109 Tech. Drwg I	test	Lupack	23	3.59
* ITE 109 Tech. Drwg I	test	Czupryn	23	3.59
* ITE 109 Tech. Drwg I	test	Ridings	23	3.59
* ITE 107 Wood Tech I	test	Lupack	25	3.54
* ITE 107 Wood Tech I	test	Czupryn	25	3.54
* ITE 107 Wood Tech I	test	Ridings	25	3.54
* ITE 206 Auto Tech & Rp	midterm test	Lupack	10	3.74
* ITE 206 Auto Tech & Rp	midterm test	Czupryn	10	3.74
* ITE 206 Auto Tech & Rp	midterm test	Ridings	10	3.74
ED 120 Intro Tchg.	essay	Linster	11	3.90

SUMMARY

Skill: _____

Number of course evaluations = 10

Number of different evaluators = 4

Number of student evaluations = 185

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.61

QUANTIFICATION SKILLS

Definition

Just as college graduates must be able to express themselves in an organized, clear, concise manner using appropriate verbal and non-verbal symbols, they must also be familiar with basic quantitative principles and procedures.

Quantification is the ability to know when it is appropriate to measure, count and compare and to know how to measure, count and compare when appropriate.

Desired Student Achievement

Students receiving the baccalaureate degree from Wayne State College should have the following quantification skills:

1) The ability to use appropriate instruments to measure number, mass, magnitude, and duration of time.

2) The ability to determine if problems can be solved using quantitative techniques.

3) The ability to record data and to plot and interpret graphs and charts.

4) The ability to use calculators or computers to solve problems.

5) The ability to use arithmetic, geometric, algebraic, and statistical techniques to solve problems.

6) The ability to estimate quantities.

7) The ability to use basic formulas to convert units of measure.

8) The ability to determine probability.

9) The ability to use appropriate measurements in the analysis of art.

Performance Level Criteria

Members of the Quantification Skills subcommittee will evaluate the level of each student's performance on a scale ranging from highly effective (5) to not effective (1). Highly effective performance indicates a superlative level of student achievement while performance judged to be not effective suggests that the student has serious difficulty displaying an acceptable level of achievement.

Data

Number of Course Evaluations = 33 (some with combined multiple sections)

Number of Different Evaluators = 3 (please see attached vitas)

Number of Student Evaluations = 1526

Overall Mean of Attained Quantification Skills = 3.57

Mean Score of Attained Quantification Skills

(General Education Courses = 3.54, n = 1302)

(Non-General Education Courses = 3.74, n = 224)

Mean Score of Attained Quantification Skills by Course Level:

100 level = 3.59	Student n = 1508
200 level = 0	Student n = 0
300 level = 2.00	Student n = 18
400 level = 0	Student n = 0

Mean Score of Attained Quantification Skills by Division:

App. Sci. = 3.35, n = 48	HPERA = - , n = 0
Business = 3.62, n = 1334	Humanities = - , n = 0
Ed/Psych. = - , n = 0	Math/Sci. = 3.22, n = 144
Fine Arts = - , n = 0	Soc. Sci. = - , n = 0

Mean Score of Attained Quantification Skills by Each Evaluator:

Evaluator A = 3.56, n = 497
Evaluator B = 3.57, n = 507
Evaluator C = 3.58, n = 522

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Quantification

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* BIO 110 Concepts of Biology	Test	Imdieke	3	4.00
BUS 120 Business Math	Test	Emry	14	3.88
* MAT 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Emry	24	3.13
* MAT 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Imdieke	24	3.13
* MAT 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Johar	24	3.13
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Emry	182	3.30
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Imdieke	182	3.30
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Johar	182	3.30
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Emry	188	3.88
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Imdieke	188	3.88
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Johar	188	3.88
BUS 102 Business Calc. Machines	Final Exam	Johar	28	3.88

SUMMARY

Skill: Quantification

Number of course evaluations = 33 (some with multiple sections)

Number of different evaluators = 3

Number of student evaluations = 1526

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.57

*Satisfies General Education Requirements

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Quantification

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
ITE* 351 Graphic Arts	Final Exam	Johar	8	2.25
ITE* 351 Graphic Arts	Final Exam	Imdieke	4	2.50
ITE* 351 Graphic Arts	Final Exam	Emry	6	1.33
BUS 120 Business Math	Final Exam	Johar	15	4.47
BUS 120 Business Math	Final Exam	Emry	13	4.00
BUS 120 Business Math	Final Exam	Imdieke	16	2.94
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Final Exam	Johar	17	2.76
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Final Exam	Emry	16	3.00
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Final Exam	Imdieke	14	3.07
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Mid-Term Exam	Emry	29	3.50
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Mid-Term Exam	Imdieke	29	3.50
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Mid-Term Exam	Johar	29	3.50

SUMMARY

Skill: _____

Number of course evaluations =

Number of different evaluators =

Number of student evaluations =

Overall mean of attained skill level =

*Satisfies General Education Requirements

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Quantification

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Johar	8	3.75
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Imdieke	7	4.00
ITE* 104 General Crafts	Test	Johar	9	4.11
ITE* 104 General Crafts	Test	Emry	9	4.33
ITE* 104 General Crafts	Test	Imdieke	12	4.08
MAT* 110 Fundamentals of Math	Test	Emry	7	4.43
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Final Exam	Johar	14	4.07
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Final Exam	Emry	19	3.84
BUS 102 Business Calc. Mach.	Final Exam	Imdieke	18	4.11

SUMMARY

Skill: _____

Number of course evaluations =

Number of different evaluators =

Number of student evaluations =

Overall mean of attained skill level =

* Satisfies General Education Requirements

ANALYSIS SKILLS

Definition

Analytic skill involves identifying the parts of a whole and the relationships of those parts to the whole. It includes the ability to identify the essential components of ideas, events, problems, and processes; to draw logical deductions about those components; and to recognize the limitations of these deductions. Since most problems are not isolated from one another, analytic skill includes the ability to establish relationships, where they exist, between problems.

Analytic competence also involves the ability to think critically and to solve problems.

Desired Student Achievement

Students receiving the baccalaureate degree from Wayne State College should have the following analytic skills:

1) The ability to recognize what facts or assumptions are essential to or implicit in a thesis, claim, explanation, argument, or belief.

2) The ability to recognize and distinguish between the structural elements of an oral or written communication, including introduction, premises, conclusion, and illustrations.

3) The ability to devide compound or complex claims into simpler components.

4) The ability to detect relationships between ideas presented.

5) The ability to perceive connections between facts, events, or elements presented.

6) The ability to recognize how a theory, process, work of art, or scientific concept explains or orders diverse elements.

7) The ability to reason inductively and deductively.

8) The ability to assess the validity of inductive and deductive

arguments.

9) The ability to detect cause and effect.

10) The ability to distinguish between the important and unimportant details in a passage or presentation.

11) The ability to detect faulty reasoning.

12) The ability to detect inconsistency and incoherence.

13) The ability to gather sufficient information to provide a data base for analysis.

14) The ability to distinguish between fact and assumption.

Performance Level Criteria

Members of the Analysis Skills subcommittee will evaluate the level of each student's performance on a scale ranging from highly effective to not effective. Highly effective performance indicates a superlative level of student achievement while performance judged to be not effective suggests that the student has serious difficulty displaying an acceptable level of achievement.

Data

Number of Course Evaluations = 44

Number of Different Evaluators = 2

Number of Student Evaluations = 756

Overall Mean of Attained Analysis Skills = 2.88

Mean Score of Attained Analysis Skills:

General Education Courses = 2.82, n = 476

Non-General Education Courses = 2.99, n = 280

Mean Score of Attained Analysis Skills by Course Level:

100 level = 2.63	Student n = 498
200 level = 3.09	Student n = 93
300 level = 4.53	Student n = 19
400 level = 2.73	Student n = 136
500 level = 3.80	Student n = 10

Mean Score of Attained Analysis Skills by Division:

App. Sci = 1.59, n = 37	HPERA = 2.40, n = 115
Business = 3.00, n = 3	Humanities = 3.04, n = 237
Ed/Psych = 3.26, n = 90	Math/Sci = 2.71, n = 56
Fine Arts = - , n = 0	Soc Sci = 2.89, n = 218

Mean Score of Attained Analysis Skills by Each Evaluator:

Evaluator D = 2.95, n = 409
Evaluator E = 2.80, n = 347

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Analysis

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* ENG 160 Types of Literature	Essay Test	Blaser	28	3.32
* BIO 110 Concepts of Biology	Test	Blaser	17	2.53
* GEO 101 Principles of Geography	Test	Blaser	26	2.73
* GEO 101 Principles of Geography	Test	Blaser	25	2.80
* HIS 100 Western Heritage	Test	Blaser	28	3.29
PSY 210 Child Psychology	Essay	Blaser	3	3.67
* BIO 110 Concepts of Biology	Test	Blaser	2	3.00
SOC 240 Regional Ethnography	Test	Blaser	5	3.20
PSY 450 Abnormal Psychology	Test	Blaser	36	3.14
CNA 335 Theatre History	Take Home Exam	Blaser	6	4.83
SOC 500 Native Amer. Culture	Essay Exam	Blaser	5	4.60
SOC 200 Social Problems	Test	Blaser	28	3.18

SUMMARY

Skill: Analysis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 209

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.14

* Satisfies General Education Requirements

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Analysis

Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* PED 141 Health and Hygiene	Test	Blaser	26	2.19
* ITE 107 Woodworking I	Test	Blaser	4	1.00
* ITE 107 Woodworking Tech.	Test	Blaser	11	2.45
PED 451 Care/Prevent. Ath. Inj.	Paper	Blaser	22	2.45
* BUS 122 Personal Finance	Test	Blaser	3	3.00
PED 451 Care/Preven. Ath. Inj.	Paper	Blaser	23	2.74
* MAT 210 Concepts of Math	Test	Blaser	15	2.60
PSY 215 Adolescent Psych.	Paper	Blaser	28	2.93
* ITE 206 Auto Tech and Repair	Test	Blaser	11	3.73
* ENG 100 Composition Skills	Essay	Blaser	20	2.75
SOC 415 Urban Sociology	Test	Blaser	11	3.55
* GEO 101 Principles of Geog.	Test	Blaser	26	3.19

SUMMARY

Skill: Analysis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 200

Overall mean of attained skill level = 2.76

64

* Satisfies General Education Requirements

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Analysis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
PED 451	Care/Prevent. Ath. Inj.	Essay	Garlick	21	2.24
POS 396	Political Anthropology	Essay	Garlick	7	3.86
SOC 500	Native Amer. Culture	Essay	Garlick	5	3.00
CNA* 110	Interpersonal Communication	Essay	Garlick	16	2.44
BIO* 110	Concepts in Biology	Test	Garlick	3	2.00
GEO* 101	Principles of Geography	Test	Garlick	24	2.13
CNA 335	Theatre History	Essay	Garlick	6	5.00
ENG* 170	Approaches to Literature	Essay	Garlick	28	2.86
ITE* 104	General Crafts	Test	Garlick	11	2.55
ENG* 160	Types of Literature	Essay	Garlick	28	3.00
GST 196	Writing Improvement	Essay	Garlick	28	2.00
HIS* 100	Western Heritage I	Essay	Garlick	28	1.89

SUMMARY

Skill: Analysis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 205

Overall mean of attained skill level = 2.52

65

* Satisfies General Education Requirements

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Analysis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
PHI* 101	Intro to Philosophy	Test	Garlick	23	4.00
EDU 120	Intro to Teaching	Essay	Garlick	20	3.90
ENG* 170	Approaches to Literature	Essay	Garlick	16	4.19
ENG* 100	Composition Skills	Essay	Garlick	20	2.20
MAT* 110	Fundamentals of Math	Test	Garlick	19	3.05
ENG* 100	Composition Skills	Essay	Garlick	18	2.83
PED 451	Care/Prevent. Ath. Inj.	Essay	Garlick	23	2.39
PSY 210	Child Psychology	Essay	Garlick	3	3.00

SUMMARY

Skill: Analysis

Number of course evaluations = 8

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 142

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.20

66

* Satisfies General Education Requirements

SYNTHESIS SKILLS

Definition

Synthesis means putting together separate elements into a usable or satisfying whole such as a theory, a process, a work of art, or a physical construction. It is the organization of phenomena, events, ideas, or beliefs to yield a new order which was not previously apparent. (A theorist, for example, seeks to pull together seemingly disparate data into a comprehensible whole.)

Synthesizing skills are those which help an individual integrate basic knowledge, feelings, or the like. At all levels of every field of study and work this skill allows individuals to create innovative combinations of ideas, objects, processes, and people. Students with highly developed synthesizing skills are adept at putting apparently unrelated facts into a common frame of reference. They are able to find unifying themes or common threads that enable them to deal effectively with diffuse bodies of information. They not only possess a facility for constructing a general framework to accommodate whatever information they have, but they can move beyond that information, applying its principles to new situations or other bodies of information.

Desired Student Achievement

Students receiving a baccalaureate degree from Wayne State College should have the following synthesizing skills:

1) The ability to organize related facts, ideas, and beliefs into a coherent framework.

2) The ability to introduce new facts, ideas, and/or beliefs into an existing framework.

3) The ability to extrapolate from known data to unknown.

4) The ability to recognize connections between theory and practical application.

5) The ability to use data and methods of different disciplines to understand a problem.

Performance Level Criteria

Members of the Synthesis Skills subcommittee will evaluate the level of each student's performance on a scale ranging from highly effective to not effective. Highly effective performance indicates a superlative level of student achievement while performance judged to be not effective suggests that the student has serious difficulty displaying an acceptable level of achievement.

Data

Number of Course Evaluations = 58

Number of Different Evaluators = 3

Number of Student Evaluations = 1247

Overall Mean of Attained Synthesis Skills = 3.62

Mean Score of Attained Synthesis Skills:

General Education Courses = 3.79, n = 584

Non-General Education Courses = 3.46, n = 663

Mean Score of Attained Synthesis Skills by Course Level:

100 level = 3.59	Student n = 780
200 level = 3.49	Student n = 225
300 level = 4.01	Student n = 162
400 level = 3.42	Student n = 74
500 level = 3.67	Student n = 6

Mean Score of Attained Synthesis Skills by Division

App. Sci. = 4.18, n = 130	HPERA = 3.58, n = 109
Business = 3.11, n = 207	Humanities = 3.95, n = 216
Ed/Psych = 3.35, n = 188	Math/Sci = 3.22, n = 95
Fine Arts = - , n = 0	Soc Sci = 3.79, n = 302

Mean Score of Attained Synthesis Skills by Each Evaluator:

Evaluator F = 3.58, n = 848
Evaluator G = 3.58, n = 335
Evaluator H = 4.50, n = 64

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Synthesis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* BIO 110	Concepts of Biology	Test	Hansen	20	3.85
* ITE 206	Auto Tech & Repair	Mid-Term Exam	Hansen	11	3.45
* MAT 110	Fundamentals of Math	Final Exam	Hansen	38	2.97
PED 200	Intro to Motor Learning	Final Exam	Hansen	44	3.82
* HIS 160	U.S. History I	Test	Hansen	23	3.48
BUS 102	Bus. Calc. Machines	Final Exam	Hansen	49	2.57
PED 451	Care/Prev. Ath. Inj.	Paper	Hansen	22	4.05
SOC 500	Native Amer. Cult.	Test	Hansen	6	3.67
PSY 210	Child Psychology	Case-Study	Hansen	3	4.33
* BIO 110	Concepts of Biology	Test	Hansen	4	4.00
* ITE 107	Wood Tech. I	Test	Hansen	4	4.50
PED 451	Care/Prev. Ath. Inj.	Reaction Paper	Hansen	24	4.00

SUMMARY

Skill: Synthesis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 248

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.45

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Synthesis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
SOC 200	Social Problems	Test	Hansen	44	3.89
BUS 120	Business Math	Final Exam	Hansen	43	2.42
*ITE 351	Graphics I	Final Exam	Hansen	15	3.80
BUS 102	Business Calc. Mach.	Mid-Term Exam	Hansen	51	3.47
SOC 220	Social Problems II	Test	Hansen	36	3.39
POS 300	Urban Govt. and Politics	Final Exam	Hansen	13	4.08
*PSY 101	General Psychology	Test	Hansen	64	3.28
*ITE 107	Woodworking Tech.	Test	Hansen	13	4.54
GST 196	Writing Skills Imp.	Essay	Hansen	25	3.28
GEO 220	Economic Geography	Final Exam	Hansen	10	3.40
ITE 101	Communication Systems	Test	Hansen	2	4.50
*ENG 100	Composition Skills	Quiz	Hansen	20	3.65

SUMMARY

Skill: Synthesis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 336

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.43

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Synthesis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
CNA 335	Theatre History	Test (Take-Home)	Hansen	6	4.00
BUS 124	Intro to Business	Test	Hansen	30	3.47
BUS 124	Intro to Business	Test	Hansen	34	3.91
GEO 370	Geog. of Latin Amer.	Final Exam	Hansen	8	3.38
* ITE 109	Tech. Drawing I	Test	Hansen	16	4.25
* ENG 100	Advanced Comp.	Essay	Hansen	12	3.83
* ENG 170	Approaches to Literature	Exam	Hansen	14	4.00
EDU 301	Elementary Schools	Final Exam	Hansen	36	4.19
CSL 324	Fundamentals of Counseling	Test	Hansen	44	3.55
* GEO 101	Principles of Geography	Final Exam	Hansen	24	3.54
SOC 415	Urban Sociology	Essay Test	Hansen	10	4.10
* ITE 109	Tech. Drawing I	Test	Hansen	30	4.13

SUMMARY

Skill: Synthesis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 264

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.84

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Synthesis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
* GEO 101	Principles of Geography	Test	Blayney	28	3.82
* BIO 110	Concepts of Biology	Test	Blayney	10	1.00
* PHI 101	Intro to Philosophy	Test	Blayney	24	4.83
* ENG 100	Composition Skills	Test	Blayney	21	3.19
* GEO 101	Principles of Geography	Final Exam	Blayney	28	3.64
* ENG 280	Themes in Literature	Test	Blayney	26	4.35
* ENG 100	Composition Skills	Essay	Blayney	22	3.59
SOC 240	Regional Ethnography	Test	Blayney	15	3.13
PSY 215	Adolescent Psychology	Test	Blayney	17	2.47
* HIS 100	Western Heritage I	Test	Blayney	28	4.50
SOC 330	Political Anthropology	Test	Blayney	16	4.25
PSY 450	Abnormal Psychology	Test	Blayney	18	1.50

SUMMARY

Skill: Synthesis

Number of course evaluations = 12

Number of different evaluators = 1

Number of student evaluations = 253

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.45

APEP SKILL SUMMARY FORM

Skill: Synthesis

	Course Title	Type of Material Examined	Evaluator	Number of Students Evaluated	Mean Skill Level Attained
GST 196	Writing Improvement	Test	Blayney	14	4.14
PED 241	First Aid	Test	Blayney	19	1.95
*BIO 110	Concepts of Biology	Test	Blayney	23	3.92
*ENG 160	Types of Literature	Test	Blayney	26	4.19
CSL 324	Fund. of Counseling	Exam	Netherda	6	5.00
*ENG 160	Types of Literature	Essay	Netherda	6	5.00
*HIS 100	Western Heritage I	Exam	Netherda	6	5.00
*ITE 109	Tech. Drawing I	Test	Netherda	28	4.11
ITE 306	Small Engines	Test	Netherda	11	5.00
SOC 330	Political Anthropology	Test	Netherda	7	4.00

SUMMARY

Skill: Synthesis

Number of course evaluations = 10

Number of different evaluators = 2

Number of student evaluations = 146

Overall mean of attained skill level = 3.99

APPENDIX

Gathering Longitudinal General Education Data

(Attachments A-G)

Because of the difficulty of matching assessment instruments with institution-specific student outcomes, many institutions have devised tests which address specific program objectives generated by faculty committees as described in a previous section of this paper.

As part of an institution's on-going general education program evaluation process, data should be gathered for longitudinal analysis in order to monitor enrollment and student flow statistics to provide a basis from which curricular decisions might be made. The following forms, included as attachments, can be used to facilitate this process.

Attachment A: Enrollment Statistics for Selected General Education Courses--By Semester

General education requirements at most institutions comprise one-fourth to one-third of the student's undergraduate experience. At some institutions these requirements are specified as particular courses to be completed while, at the other extreme, some institutions require only that a certain minimum number of credit-hours of coursework be completed in several broad areas of the curriculum.

In the former case, monitoring general education enrollment statistics is quite easy. In the latter, however, because of the myriad possible ways of completing the institutional requirement, it is very difficult to maintain a comprehensive overview of the various "tracks" or paths through the program except by a student-by-student, course-by-course accounting.

Since most general education programs lie somewhere between these two extremes and specify some courses while allowing others to be selected from broad curricular areas, it may become necessary to select "key" representative courses to be monitored. Once these courses are selected the following information should be gathered: 1) Division of instruction, school, or other appropriate academic component; 2) Number of credit hours per course; 3) Number of sections of the course being offered per semester; 4) Total course enrollment (including all sections); 5) Total student-credit-hour production; and 6) Average section size (total number of students divided by total enrollment).

Attachment B: General Education Student-Credit-Hour Production by Semester as Percent of Total Undergraduate Production

The Registrar's Office or Institutional Research Office should have readily available a semester-by-semester account of the total undergraduate student-credit-hour production which can be compared to the general education student-credit-hour production. To insure an appropriate selection, the representative general education courses should at least comprise a proportion of the total undergraduate production which approximates the proportion of the general education requirements in an individual student program. (For example, if 40 semester hours are required in general education and if a student needs 120 semester hours to graduate then, if properly selected, the representative general education student-credit-hour production should be approximately one-third of the total undergraduate student-credit-hour production.

Attachment C: General Education Student-Credit-Hour Production by Division (or other academic component)

This table provides a semester-by-semester and division-by-division matrix of student-credit-hour production. Care must be taken to emphasize that no value judgments are being placed upon the extent to which each component contributes to the general education program, especially since these data reflect only selected courses and may not be entirely representative.

Attachment D: General Education Student-Credit-Hour Production by Division as a Percent of Total General Education (self-explanatory)

Attachment E: General Education Student-Credit-Hour Production by Division as a Percent of Total Undergraduate Production (self-explanatory)

Attachment F: Enrollment Statistics for Selected General Education Courses by Division (one form per semester)

This form reorganizes already available information into a different format allowing emphasis to be placed upon the comparison of academic components for a given semester. This form should be differentiated from Attachment C which provides a semester-by-semester emphasis.

Attachment G: Enrollment Statistics for Selected General Education Courses (course-by-course, one form per course)

This form collates all information regarding each specific course which has been selected for inclusion. It also identifies the proportion of each division's contribution to the general education program by that specific course relative to the other selected courses from that academic component.

Attachment A

Enrollment Statistics for

Selected General Education Courses

Academic Year _____

Course	Division	Credits	Semester	# of Sections	Total Enroll.	Stud/Credit Hr. Produc.
ENG 100 Comp Skills						
CNA 100 Basic Sp. Comm						
CNA 110 Interp Comm						
ART 241 Under Art						
MUS 100 Mus in G.C.						
IDS 101 West Cult 1						
IDS 102 West Cult 2						
IDS 111 Amer Cult 1						
IDS 112 Amer Cult 2						
HIS 100 West Htg 1						
HIS 101 West Htg 2						
HIS 160 U.S. to 1877						
HIS 162 U.S. From 1877						
ECO 100 Prin Econ I/II						
GEO 101 Princ Geo						
GEO 220 World Reg Geo						
POS 100 Am Nat'l Gov						
SOC 101 Intro Soc						
BUS 122 Pers Finance						
MAT 110 Fund Math						
MAT 120 Intro Math						
PHS 100 Phy Sci						
EAS 110 Gen Eart Sci I, II						
HEC 310 Everyday Liv						
HEC 315 Family Econ						
ITE 104 Gen Crafts						
SAE 121 Gen Safety						
PSY 101 Gen Psych						
PED 141 Person H & H						
PED 101 Bas Skil. I&II						

Average Section Size = _____

Attachment B

General Education (Selected Courses)

Student Credit Hour Production by Division

as a Percent of Total Undergraduate Production

Semester	Appl. Sci.	Business	Ed/Psych.	Fine Arts	HPERA	Human.	Math/Sci.	Social Sci.	Interdis.

Attachment C

53

General Education (Selected Courses)

Student Credit Hour Production by Division

Semester	Appl. Sci.	Business	Ed/Psych.	Fine Arts	HPERA	Human.	Math/Sci.	Social Sci.	Interdis.

80

81

Attachment D

General Education (Selected Courses)

Student Credit Hour Production by Division

as a Percent of Total General Ed.

Semester	Appl. Sci.	Business	Ed/Psych.	Fine Arts	HPERA	Human.	Math/Sci.	Social Sci.	Interdis.

Attachment E

General Education (Selected Courses)

Student Credit Hour Production by Semester

as Percent of Total Undergraduate Production

Semester	General Education St. Cred. Hr. Prod.	Total Undergrad. St. Cred. Hr. Prod.	Gen. Ed. as % of Total

Attachment F

Enrollment Statistics

for

Selected General Education Courses

Semester: _____

Division	Average Section Size	General Education Student Credit Hour Production	% of Total Gen. Educ.	% of Total College's St. Cr. Hour Produc.

Attachment C

Enrollment Statistics

for

Selected General Education Courses

Course Title: _____

Semester	Number of Sections	Total Enrollment	Ave. Section Size	% of Div's Gen. Ed. Cont.	% of Total Gen. Ed.
9/76					
1/77					
8/77					
1/78					
9/78					
1/79					
9/79					
1/80					
9/80					

Trends: